

Expert Declaration on Miyoko's Labeling Conventions

Dr. Adam Feltz

Dr. Silke Feltz

Introduction

The current body of research predicts and supports the idea that Miyoko's use of traditional dairy terms for plant-based products would not cause unique confusion in consumers.

Background: Consumer product literacy

There is a substantial literature on consumers' use of food product labels. Generally speaking, consumers use product labels extensively when making buying decisions. Consumers are especially likely to use product labels in buying decisions if those labels present information on the front of the package, use minimal numerical information, and include graphs and symbols, and use simple adjective or other descriptors (for a review, see (Campos, Doxey, & Hammond, 2011)). These results have led some to claim that food product labels are often good sources of information for consumers and consumers can often use that information in buying decisions (Campos et al., 2011).

While consumers often accurately interpret and use product labels, consumers do not always use product information on labels or interpret that information correctly. There are various factors that are associated with whether a consumer uses and understands information on packaging. For example, many people have difficulty making quantitative comparisons between items using the term calorie. While many people understand that a calorie is a basic measure of energy, they have difficulty in comparing two different products in terms of calories or making conversion among different serving sizes. Generally, as the computational complexity of the task increases (e.g., conversions, comparisons, calories per 100g to calories per gram), consumer confusion increases (Cowburn & Stockley, 2005). There are also motivational and demographic variables that are related to the use and understanding of product or nutrition labels. For example, those who are more health conscious are more likely to use and understand nutritional labels than less health conscious and those who are more educated are more likely to understand information on product labels compared to those who are less educated (Hall & Osses, 2013; Hess, Visschers, & Siegrist, 2012).

A priori, the question is whether the factors that are associated with (mis)understanding labels are likely to behave differentially between plant-based products and animal-based products. **Given the brief review herein, there is a strong a priori reason to suspect that consumers are not substantially confused by many plant-based product labels.** Or, if consumers are confused, they are not any more confused than they are for animal-based product labels. There are at least three reasons to think that consumers will be no more confused about plant-based food labels than they are about animal-based food labels. First, labeling that is used in plant-based products is likely to be well-understood by consumers because often vegan-

relevant information is on the front of food labels and contains simple adjectives (e.g., ‘vegan butter’; ‘vegan chicken’; ‘vegan beef crumbles’; ‘plant-based cheese’). As the research noted above suggests, people are fairly good at understanding those simple adjective labels. So, they are also likely to be good at identifying, using, and understanding information on plant-based food labels and understanding key differences between plant-based and animal-based products.

Second, more technical information is likely to be equally misunderstood on both plant-based and animal-based products. For example, some people are likely to misunderstand the term ‘GMO Free’ on food labels. ‘Genetically modified’ is a complicated technical and legal term that is unlikely for some people to fully understand. However, the ‘GMO Free’ label can apply to both vegan and non-vegan products. There is little reason to think misunderstanding of ‘GMO’ would increase on plant-based labels compared to animal-based labels because people are likely to (mis)understand the term on both product labels. Consequently, we should expect that people would be just as good at identifying GMO free products in both plant-based and animal-based products.

Third, different demographic, motivational, or educational differences are also not likely to differentially influence the understanding and use of information between plant-based and animal-based products. For example, those who are health-conscious are motivated to understand food labels more than those who are not health conscious. For this reason, those people are more likely to understand sometimes difficult to interpret food label information (e.g., conversions between portion sizes) than those who are less motivated. However, this motivation would apply to both plant-based and animal-based food products. There is little reason to expect that people would only be motivated to understand animal-based food labels. Hence, motivational, demographic, or education differences are not likely to translate into differential understanding of any food labels.

In sum, given what we currently know, there is little reasons to expect that there would be substantial differences between the use, understanding, and interpretation of plant-based and animal-based food labels. The features that make labels (mis)understood are shared between plant-based and animal-based food labels. Likewise, demographic features associated with greater use and understanding of food labels would likely surface in relations to all kinds of products.

Background: Empirical research on plant-based naming conventions

Empirical research largely supports the a priori predictions that there would not be much confusion about plant-based products labels; and if there is, there would be similar confusion about animal-based product labels using similar naming conventions. To our knowledge, there are two published studies that directly address whether consumers are confused about plant-based product labels specifically. Neither of the two studies suggest that using traditional dairy terms for plant-based products increases consumer confusion.

The first set of studies was conducted by us, Feltz and Feltz (2019). In this work, we tested two common arguments made for why plant-based products should not be allowed to use terms traditionally used for animal-based dairy products (e.g., ‘milk’, ‘whey’, ‘cream’, ‘cheese’, ‘butter’). Both of the arguments involve whether using traditional animal-based terms for plant-based products causes confusion in consumers. There are two potential types of confusion that have been identified. First, using traditional dairy naming conventions for plant-based products may confuse consumers about what products they are buying. For example, if one were to use the term ‘vegan cheese’ for a plant-based product, some consumers may be confused and think that they are actually buying an animal-based cheese product. The second argument involves whether people would be confused by potential nutritional differences between animal-based and plant-based products if traditional terms for dairy products were used for animal-based products.

In Feltz and Feltz (2019), we tested these two types of arguments by having participants in an experiment look at images of a plant-based and an animal-based dairy product. To test whether consumers were likely to be confused with respect to the products they were buying, participants were asked to select which among a set of images were made with real cow’s milk. Participants were presented with 6 images that systematically varied the number of items that were animal-based and plant-based. The milk items included a variety of plant-based (e.g., soy milk) and animal-based (e.g., 2% milk) items. The cheese items included also included plant-based (e.g., dairy-free American slices) and animal-based products (e.g., Kraft American singles).

Milk and cheese product identification was tested in 2 experiments each. Here, we report the overall weighted (i.e., meta-analytically combined) averages among the studies. On average, participants accurately identified 84% of the animal-based milk items and 88% of the plant-based milk items. The numerical difference in percentage was not significant, meaning that one should not conclude that there is a difference with respect to consumers’ identification of plant-based and animal based milk items. A similar pattern emerged on average for the cheese items. Participants accurately identified 81% of the plant-based items on average and 74% of the animal-based products. Again, while participants were numerically better at identifying plant-based products, statistically one should not conclude that there is a reliable difference. **These data suggest that consumers are, on average, good at identifying plant-based dairy items as plant-based—and are just as good as they are at identifying animal-based products as animal-based.** Hence, these studies suggest there is no empirical evidence to support the claim that using traditional dairy terms for plant-based items results in worse product identification for plant-based and animal-based products.

Concerning nutritional confusion among plant-based and animal-based products, a similar pattern emerges. In Feltz and Feltz (2019), we asked participants a series of questions about nutritional content of plant-based and animal-based dairy products. These questions included which product has more cholesterol, which has more sugar, which product has more sodium, which product has more calcium (among others). Again, separate studies were done for both cheese and milk products. For the milk products, only 25% of people made mistakes when

identifying nutritional differences between animal-based and plant-based products. Similarly, about 27% of people made mistakes identifying nutritional differences between plant-based and animal-based cheese products. It should be noted that this task is challenging since it requires the comparison of two different products on the dimension of interest (e.g., whether one product has more sodium than another). Even given this difficulty, the overall accuracy expressed in these studies is not much different from consumer accuracy at identifying nutritional content specifically about animal-based products (e.g., 70% of participants in the study reported below did not accurately identified GMO ingredients in animal-based dairy products). Again, these studies suggest that there is little evidence that people make systematic errors as a function of identifying nutritional differences between plant-based and animal-based dairy products.

One final piece of evidence is relevant from our Feltz and Feltz (2019) food labeling studies. We developed two measures of knowledge of dairy products. The first was called the Soy scale. The Soy scale asks six true/false questions about nutritional differences between soy milk and whole milk (e.g., “Whole milk has more calcium than fortified soy milk”). The second is the Milk Scale. The Milk Scale asks six true/false questions concerning nutritional differences between whole milk and skim milk (e.g., “Whole cow milk has more calcium than skim cow milk”). When comparing results from the two knowledge scales, people were generally *better* at answering the soy v. milk questions accurately compared to the milk v. milk questions. Averaging over 6 studies that used these knowledge scales, participants on average answered 3.47 questions correctly for the Soy Scale but only 1.89 questions correctly for the Milks Scale—a difference that is statistically different. Some caution should be used when interpreting these data since slightly different items were used in the measures. But overall, these results are consistent with data suggesting that many people are not aware of nutritional differences among different kinds of cow’s milk (Finnell & John, 2017).

The only other published study that we know of that directly addresses whether dairy naming conventions confuse consumers was conducted by Gleckel (forthcoming). In this study, Gleckel tested whether people thought that products described only in terms of ‘cultured vegan spread’ and ‘cultured vegan butter’ contained animal components. Consistent with the results from Feltz and Feltz (2019), 71% of participants correctly identified that ‘cultured vegan spread’ did not contain dairy from cows and 92% of participants correctly responded that ‘cultured vegan butter’ did not contain dairy from cows. While Gleckel’s analyses suggested that the differences in percentages between the ‘spread’ and ‘butter’ differences was not significant, our re-analysis of the reported data suggested that there was a modest, but significant, difference between ‘spread’ and ‘butter language. That means that, based on these data, not allowing non-dairy products to use traditional dairy terms would likely *increase* consumer confusion.

The general pattern of results from these studies is fairly clear. First, **on average, people are not confused by plant-based products using traditional dairy naming conventions.** Consumers are accurate at identifying products and are just as good at identifying nutritional differences among plant-based and animal-based products as they are at identifying nutritional differences in animal-based products. Additionally, the data suggest that on average using dairy

naming conventions for plant-based products may decrease some kinds of consumer confusion (e.g., composition of products; nutritional differences).

Based on these data—along with the a priori predictions from the previous section—one should expect that similar patterns of results should be found with respect to all plant-based dairy products that use traditional dairy naming conventions. At this point, there is no empirical reason to think that any plant-based products are likely to engender the kinds of confusion we have reviewed. We would therefore be very comfortable extrapolating that if studies were conducted on plant-based dairy products using the same kinds of naming conventions, a similar pattern of results would be obtained suggesting no substantial confusion among consumers (or at least no greater confusion than occurs in more traditional animal-based products).

We would expect, and are comfortable predicting, that given the strong a priori reason not to suspect substantial confusion along with supporting empirical evidence, that Miyoko's use of traditional naming conventions would not in result in unique confusion among consumers. Rather, and perhaps paradoxically, using those traditional dairy naming conventions could actually help consumers make better, more informed choices about what they are consuming. While the evidence for the latter claim is weaker, it is consistent with the observed pattern of results. And, we feel very confident that there *is not* currently existing evidence that would support the claim concerning confusion among consumers in the context of plant-based dairy naming conventions.

Empirical research about Miyoko's use of naming conventions

The current body of research predicts and supports the idea that Miyoko's use of traditional dairy terms for plant-based products would not cause unique confusion in consumers. We have conducted a study to help support the general findings reviewed above as they relate to Miyoko's products.

In this study we tested 3 common, popular items in the Miyoko's portfolio of products: vegan butter, vegan cheese, and vegan cream cheese. Participants were presented with images of all of the sides of a typical box for these products. These boxes contained several traditional dairy terms including 'butter', 'cheese', 'cream cheese'. The boxes also had several prominent terms listed including 'cholesterol free', 'GMO free', 'lactose free', 'made from plants', and 'cruelty free'. The actual USDA nutritional label was also included (back of the box) so that participants could consult the labels. We also included images of the box that included other dairy-relevant phrases such as 'revolutionizing dairy with plants' along with an image of a woman hugging a cow. These images and phrases were on the labels for all three products we tested.

Participants were asked the following set of 'yes/no' questions, and responses are included in the parentheses (total sample size = 204 participants).

1. Is this product made with cow's milk? (81% responded 'no')
2. Does this product contain any animal products? (87% responded 'no')

3. Is this product made only with plants? (89% responded 'yes')
4. Were any animals directly harmed making this product? (90% responded 'no')
5. Were any animals used in making this product? (88% responded 'no')
6. Does this product contain lactose? (83% responded 'no')
7. Does this product contain genetically modified ingredients? (71% responded 'no')

Questions 6 and 7 included more technical nutritional information than questions 1-5, and one would expect relatively low rates of correct responses (see discussion above). We also asked the same participants if equivalent dairy-based products contained lactose (correct answer = yes) and genetically modified ingredients (correct answer = no). Eighty-five percent of participants correctly responded that the dairy based products contained lactose, and 70% responded that the product did not contain genetically modified ingredients. There was no measurable (i.e., statistical) difference between plant-based and animal-based accuracy for the lactose and GMO questions. So, the performance on animal-based products for those two items were not significantly better than performance on the plant-based Miyoko's products.

We also asked two follow-up questions about the nature of the product and whether Miyoko's products could revolutionize what is considered a dairy product. The two true/false follow-up questions were:

8. Do you consider this product (butter/cream cheese/cheese)? Y/N
9. Do you think this product has the potential to change what products are considered to be 'dairy' products? Y/N

These questions are not factual, information questions. There is no normatively correct answer to Questions 8 and 9, so one should expect more variance in responses. (unlike questions 1-7). Overall, there was indifference in a statistical sense whether the Miyoko's products were considered butter, cream cheese, or cheese. Roughly 55% of participants responded 'yes' to question 8. However, even though there was no difference from chance in the way people responded to Question 8, 69% of participants responded 'yes' to Question 9. This pattern of results suggests that while responses to question 8 were no different from random responses (i.e., there was no strong preference concerning whether they would consider those plant-based products butter, cheese, or cream cheese). There was substantial agreement that the Miyoko's products could change what participants considered to be 'dairy' products. For Question 9, more than 69% of participants thought that the Miyoko's product could change what they considered to be a 'dairy' product—including some who currently do not think that those products are instances of butter, cream cheese, or cheese. So, taking the response to the pair of Questions 8 and 9, it appears that there is some evidence that at least a substantial number of people think that Miyoko's could revolutionize dairy with plants by changing what products are considered to be 'dairy' products, even for those who did not think that the Miyoko's products are dairy products.

One final bit of evidence is relevant for understanding whether people think that Miyoko's could revolutionize dairy with plants by changing what products are considered to be

‘dairy’ products. In a separate study, we presented participants with images of all sides of a Miyoko’s butter package. On the front of the label, the phrase ‘revolutionizing dairy with plants’ is prominently displayed (as is the case with many Miyoko’s packages). We asked participants to respond to the following question: “What do you think ‘revolutionizing dairy with plants’ on the label means?”. Participants were allowed to give free responses to the question—i.e., participants were allowed to write out their thoughts in a text box. The following is a sample of actual free responses from participants (sic):

“Making dairy products that are not from cows milk.”

“Revolutionizing dairy with products by making them from plants instead of cows.”

“I think it means that this product is giving people a good alternative to traditional dairy products.

“means trying to replace some milk products with plant products for people who want to eat or drink that type of product.”

“I think it's saying that they will end up disrupting the dairy industry with products like these.”

These free responses indicate that a substantial number of people are comfortable and understand what “revolutionizing dairy with plants” means.

The example free responses fit a larger pattern in the data we collected. To illustrate, we used an unsupervised machine learning algorithm (i.e., Latent Dirichlet Allocation) to classify the 3 most common topics to were expressed in all of the free responses. These topics are identified by the frequency of words and the location of the words in the free responses. The algorithm does not tell us what the topics are (that is left to the user of the program), but in this case, there seems to be a fairly clear pattern in all three topics that ‘revolutionizing’ meant something along the lines of making dairy products from plants (Topic 1), making cheese that are animal-based dairy free (Topic 2), and providing an alternative to anima-based milk (Topic 3).

Topic 1: make, vegan, food, cow, revolution, instead, cheese, taste, milk, believe

Topic 2: butter, free, made, hormone, revolution, like soy, Miyoko, milk, come

Topic 3: use, mean, animal milk, good, base, think, new, alternative, people

For these reasons, we think there are many people who expressed a sentiment that ‘revolutionizing dairy with plants’ meant to change the way dairy is made or to produce alternatives to the way more traditional dairy is made.

Conclusions and Recommendations

In summary, we feel that that the current body of theory and evidence supports that claim that there is not substantial confusion involving plant-based products that use traditional dairy terms like (but not limited to) ‘milk’, ‘cheese’, ‘whey’, and ‘cream’. These terms appear not to

mislead consumers and are not likely to mislead consumers in the future, especially as more and more people become familiar with plant-based products.

While the exact causal mechanism that is responsible for consumers being able to understand and integrate plant-based labeling information is currently unknown, there is reason to think that the same mechanisms that are operative in non-plant based products operate here. For example, information that is simple, non-quantitative, and on the front of the labels are likely to be used and understood by consumers. Almost all of the terms that used for plant-based products fall into these categories. For example, almost all plant-based products use terms such as “vegan cheese” or “soy milk” or “plant-based cream cheese” on the front of the packaging. Other information that is not prominently displayed on the package front (e.g., “GMO free”) may not be used or understood by some consumers. But our data suggest that the confusion is likely to persist for animal-based products. So, simply changing naming conventions is not likely to remedy that confusion.

We see little scientific reason to change the way Miyoko’s labels its products. Indeed, the pattern of results concerning the use and understanding of plant-based labels is what we would expect (and what we have seen in empirical testing of those claims) from the current body of research about how people use product labels generally. Hence, our recommendation is not to change the labeling on Miyoko’s products. In our final opinion, changing the naming conventions about plant-based dairy—such as to prohibit use of common dairy terms on plant-based foods—will at best do nothing to improve consumer understanding, and at worse will actually increase consumer misunderstanding leading even less informed buying decisions.

About Us

We have provided no previous court or deposition testimony. We are receiving no compensation for our input in this case. For a list of our qualifications, please see our CVs.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I, Dr. Adam Feltz, declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the United States, that the information in this declaration is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: March 15, 2021

Signed: 

Dr. Adam Feltz

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I, Dr. Silke Feltz, declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the United States, that the information in this declaration is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: March 15, 2021

Signed: 

Dr. Silke Feltz

References

- Campos, S., Doxey, J., & Hammond, D. (2011). Nutrition labels on pre-packaged foods: a systematic review. *Public Health and Nutrition*, 14(8), 1496-1506. doi:10.1017/S1368980010003290
- Cowburn, G., & Stockley, L. (2005). Consumer understanding and use of nutrition labelling: A systematic review. *Public Health and Nutrition*, 8, 21-28.
- Feltz, S., & Feltz, A. (2019). Consumer accuracy at identifying plant-based and animal-based milk products. *Food Ethics*, 4, 85-112.
- Finnell, K. J., & John, R. (2017). Research to Understand Milk Consumption Behaviors in a Food-Insecure Low-Income SNAP Population in the US. *Beverages*, 46, 1-12.
- Gleckel, J. (forthcoming). Are Consumers Really Confused by Plant-Based Food Labels? An Empirical Study. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3727710
- Hall, C., & Osses, F. (2013). A review to inform understanding of the use of food safety messages on food labels. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 37, 422-432.
- Hess, R., Visschers, V. H., & Siegrist, M. (2012). The role of health-related, motivational and sociodemographic aspects in predicting food label use: a comprehensive study. *Public Health and Nutrition*, 15(3), 407-414. doi:10.1017/S136898001100156X

Silke Feltz

CURRICULUM VITAE **September 2019**

219 East Duffy Street
Norman OK 73069
shfeltz@ou.edu
(850) 591 1716

EDUCATION

Michigan Technological University
Ph.D., Rhetoric, Theory & Culture, August 2019

Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg, Germany
First Bavarian Staatsexamen (Teaching Certification in English and German), Spring 2002

Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg, Germany
M.A., English and German, Fall 2001

RESEARCH AND TEACHING INTERESTS

Research Focus	Food Ethics
Areas of Specialization	Composition and Developmental Writing, Technical Communication, ESL, Elementary and Intermediate German
Areas of Competence	English and German literature, Communication Studies (public speaking, writing & research), Pedagogy

EMPLOYMENT

University of Oklahoma	Assistant Teaching Professor, 2020-Present
University of Oklahoma	Instructor, 2018-2020
Michigan Technological University, MI	Composition Program Graduate Coordinator, 2016-2018
Michigan Technological University, MI	Instructor, 2014-2018

Schreiner University, TX	Instructor, Fall 2009-2014
Schreiner University, TX	Adjunct Instructor, Fall 2008-Spring 2009
Tallahassee Community College, FL	Adjunct Instructor, Fall 2007-Spring 2008
Kishwaukee College, FL	Adjunct Instructor, Fall 2003-Spring 2004
University of South Carolina, SC	Teaching Assistant, Fall 1998-Spring 1999
Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg, Germany	Adjunct Instructor (German as a Second Language), Summer 1997

PUBLICATIONS

Peer-Reviewed Articles

Currently, I am working on two articles that received a revise and resubmit.

Tweedale, K. and Feltz, S. (2022). Inviting Empathy: Social Action in the Technical and Professional Communication Classroom. *IEEE*. (proposal accepted and manuscript submitted).

Seigel, M.; Chase, J.; Herder, W.; Feltz, S.; Kitalong, K. S.; Romney, A.; and Tweedale, K.. (2020). Monstrous Composition: Reanimating the Lecture in First-Year Writing Instruction. *College Composition and Communication*. Volume 71 Number 4. Pgs. 643-671.

Feltz, S. and Feltz, A. (2019). Consumer Accuracy at Identifying Plant-based and Animal-based Milk Items. *Food Ethics*. Pgs. 1-28.

Feltz, S. and Feltz, A. (2019). The Knowledge of Animals as Food Scale. *Human-Animal Interaction Bulletin*. Volume 7 Number 2. Pgs. 19-45.

Book Chapters

Feltz, A. and Feltz, S (2021). The Vegan Identity. *Routledge*. (currently in print)

Feltz, S. Rhetorical Constructions of the Rhetoric of Veganism. *Routledge*. (proposal accepted, manuscript submitted)

Online Articles

Feltz, S. (2018). My hive. In: *Activist History Review. The Future Is Another Country. December Issue*.

Book Reviews

Feltz, S. (2019). Review: Chimpanzee rights. *Metapsychology Online Reviews*. Ethics 23 (29).

http://metapsychology.net/poc/view_doc.php?type=book&id=8296&cn=135&fbclid=IwAR1Kw0aG5EaCviPEciguODcyef_I9VYZkNyWz_nFIGMDI0HPTe0d4eQ1P_A

Feltz, S. (2018). Review: The Oxford handbook of food ethics. *Metapsychology Online Reviews*. Ethics 22 (28).

http://metapsychology.mentalhelp.net/poc/view_doc.php?type=book&id=8108&cn=135

Feltz, S. (2017). Review: Personalities on the plate. *Metapsychology Online Reviews*. Ethics 21 (40).

http://metapsychology.mentalhelp.net/poc/view_doc.php?type=book&id=7950&cn=135

Feltz, S. & Feltz, A. (October 2016). The good life: Unifying the philosophy and psychology of well-being. *Philosophical Psychology* 29 (8). 1253-1255.

Poetry

Feltz, S. (2020). rockstar. revisited. In: *Writers: Craft & Context*. Vol 1 No 1.

<https://journals.shareok.org/writersccjournal/article/view/6/8>

Feltz, S. (2020). Daughter of India. In: *Writers: Craft & Context*.

<https://journals.shareok.org/writersccjournal/article/view/6/8>

Feltz, S. (2020). We Left Texas on Cinco de Mayo. In: *Writers: Craft & Context*.

<https://journals.shareok.org/writersccjournal/article/view/6/8>

Feltz, S. (2018). Your maybe forever goodbye. In: *Peeking Cat Poetry's Anthology*. Ed.: Sam Rose.

Feltz, S. (2018). The youngest warrior of Maharashtra. In: *Postcard Poems and Prose*.

Feltz, S. (2017). One Elbi. In: *Child Owlet Literary Magazine*.

Feltz, S. (2017). I wish you well. In: *Child Owlet Literary Magazine*.

Feltz, S. (2017). These grounds. In: *Child Owlet Literary Magazine*.

Feltz, S. (2016). Nameless. In: *Drunk Monkeys*.

<http://www.drunkmonkeys.us/poetry/2016/5/13/poetry-nameless-silke-feltz>

Feltz, S. (2016). Swimming lesson. In *Drift: Narratives from the Upper Peninsula* (pp. 14-15). Houghton, Michigan: Michigan Technological University.

Feltz, S. (2016). Defeat. In *Drift: Narratives from the Upper Peninsula* (pp. 17). Houghton, Michigan: Michigan Technological University.

Website Manager:

www.animaliq.org

TALKS AND PRESENTATIONS

Invited Talks

“Milk labeling and consumer confusion.” With Adam Feltz. February 2019 at UCLA Law School in Los Angeles, California.

“Webinar: The Texas Language Consortium.” April 2014 at Associated Colleges of the South in Kerrville, Texas.

“Shared Academics Seminar: The Texas Language Consortium.” June 2013 at National Institute for Technology in Liberal Education Shared Academics Seminar.

“The Texas Language Consortium.” April 2013 at National Institute for Technology in Liberal Education Symposium, April 2013 in Atlanta, Georgia.

“Poetry Reading: women warriors.” November 2010 at California State University Fullerton Creative Writing Workshop in Fullerton, California.

“Foreign language learning.” June 2010 at Schulkolleg Dr. Rampitsch in Nürnberg, Germany.

Peer-Reviewed Talks and Presentations

“Animal Food Consumption: Measurement and Education.” October 2019 at Deutsches Institut fuer Wirtschaftsforschung (DIW) in Berlin, Germany.

“How to engage in moral education: skilled decision making.” March 2019 at Midsouth Philosophy Conference in Memphis, Tennessee.

“Keeping it real: performance pedagogy and empathy building in the writing classroom.” March 2019 at Conference on College Composition and Communication in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

“Applied ethics and animal consumption.” March 2018 at Midsouth Philosophy Conference in Memphis, Tennessee.

“Monstrous composition: reanimating the lecture in first-year writing instruction.” March 2018 at Conference on College Composition and Communication in Kansas, Missouri.

"Embodied making and empathy in the technical communication classroom." March 2018 at American Teachers of Technical Writing in Kansas City, Kansas.

"Shared perspectives on finding perspective on the tenure track." April 2017 at Southern States Communication Association in Greenville, South Carolina.

"Expanding the moral horizon through rhetorical ecologies." April 2017 at Southern States Communication Association/Philosophy and Ethics Interest Group in Greenville, South Carolina.

"Know what you eat: Experimental philosophy and animal ethics." March 2017 at Midsouth Philosophy Conference in Memphis, Tennessee.

"Personalizing the standard: Approaches to first-year composition." October 2016 at Michigan College English Association in Warren, Michigan.

"Communication as conscience: Animal rights in a nonideal world." April 2016 at Southern States Communication Association in Austin, Texas.

"So, I'm not a good writer:' Using peer conferences to scaffold competence and confidence." April 2016 at Michigan Developmental Education Consortium, April 2016 in Bay City, Michigan.

"Moral schizophrenia and intersectionality." February 2016 at Midsouth Philosophy Conference in Memphis, Tennessee.

"*Stammtisch* approaches to crafting, networking, pedagogy, and community outreach." April 2015 at Southern States Communication Association in Tampa, Florida.

"*Le Petit Prince*: A big idea for a small liberal arts campus." November 2014 at American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages in San Antonio, Texas.

"Classroom of the future." April 2014 at Southern States Communication Association in New Orleans, Louisiana.

"Teaching beyond Schreiner: The Texas Language Consortium." October 2013 at Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association in Vancouver, Washington.

"Gallows voices: Surviving the battle of Berlin." September 2012 at West Virginia University Colloquium on Humor in Literature and Film in Morgantown, West Virginia.

"Poetry Reading: ½ a lifetime." March 2012 at Conference of College Teachers of English, in Fort Worth, Texas.

"Poetry Reading: Women warriors." April 2011 at Popular Culture Symposium in San Antonio, Texas.

"Poetry Reading: Liebestänze." April 2010 at California State University Fullerton Creative Writing and Composition Conference in Fullerton, California.

"Extreme Makeovers in the Writing Center: Mixing the materials." March 2010 at Conference of College Teachers of English in Texas.

Poster Presentations

"Food risk literacy: Knowledge of animal product consumption." November 2019 at Society of Judgment and Decision Making in Montreal, Canada.

"Food risk literacy: Results from studies of milk product literacy." November 2018 at Society of Judgment and Decision Making in New Orleans, Louisiana.

"Layered literacies, service learning, and knitting: A new approach to community advocacy and workplace readiness." April 2016 at Association of Teachers of Technical Writing in Houston, Texas.

Paper Commentaries

Comment on Travis Hreno's paper, "The liberty enhancing effects of jury nullification." March 2019 at Midsouth Philosophy Conference in Memphis, Tennessee.

Comment on Emily Tilton's paper, "Against a ban on breast implants: A feminist approach." March 2018 at Midsouth Philosophy Conference in Memphis, Tennessee.

Comment on Alicia Hall's paper, "Theory building for health-related quality of life research." March 2017 at Midsouth Philosophy Conference in Memphis, Tennessee.

Comment on Daniel Doviak's paper, "Claims, Reasons, and Degrees of Fairness." February 2016 at Midsouth Philosophy Conference in Memphis, Tennessee.

University, Departmental, and Community Talks

"Veganism as a social problem." Invited guest lecture. November 2018 at the University of Oklahoma in Norman, Oklahoma.

"Humanitarian Knitting & Wellness." Invited guest lecture. October 2018 at the University of Oklahoma in Norman, Oklahoma.

"*StreetKnits* cowl knitting workshop." March 2018 at Michigan Tech in Houghton, Michigan. This workshop was held for faculty and graduate students at Michigan Tech.

"Lunch & Learn: All about going vegan." March 2018 at Michigan Technological University in Houghton, Michigan. Invited talk.

This talk offered the Michigan Tech community an introduction and overview of veganism.

“StreetKnits: Helping the homeless one stitch at a time.” January 2018 at Houghton Rotary Club in Houghton, Michigan. Invited talk.

This talk gave an overview of the *StreetKnits* project and discussed food insecurity on college campuses in America.

“Knitting and wellness.” August 2017 at Ojibwa Community Library in Baraga, Michigan. Invited talk.

This talk gave an overview of the *StreetKnits* project and discussed the connections of knitting and well-being to Native Americans.

“Poetry reading.” March 2017 at Bluffs Nursing Home in Houghton, Michigan. Invited talk.

This poetry reading was based on my own creative writing projects.

“Poetry Reading: From Goethe to slam poetry.” January 2017 at Bluffs Nursing Home in Houghton, Michigan. Invited talk.

This poetry reading offered an overview of some of the most prominent German voices throughout time.

“Slaughter, art, and tofu: The rhetorical ecologies of the pig.” October 2016 at Rhetoric, Theory, and Culture Graduate Student Colloquium at Michigan Tech in Houghton, Michigan.

“Lunch & Learn: Knitting and Mindfulness.” October 2016 at Michigan Tech in Houghton, Michigan.

Invited talk about the connections between knitting and well-being, humanitarian knitting, and community building at Michigan Tech

“The Sexual Politics of Meat Slideshow” by Carol Adams. October 2016 at Michigan Tech in Houghton, Michigan.

This inter-campus event between Michigan Tech and Northern Michigan raised an awareness about the rhetoric of veganism

“*StreetKnits* sock knitting workshop.” March 2016 at Michigan Tech in Houghton, Michigan.

This workshop was held for faculty and graduate students at Michigan Tech.

“*StreetKnits* hat knitting workshop.” November 2015 at Michigan Tech in Houghton, Michigan.

This workshop was held for faculty and graduate students at Michigan Tech.

WORKSHOPS

Accepted and participated in the week-long “Human-Animal-Studies Summer Institute” at the University of Illinois in Urbana-Champaign in July 2018.

GRANTS

2020-Present Co-Principal Investigator for Understanding Rodeos, UCLA Law School Animal Law and Policy Small Grants Program, \$ 3,230 (with Adam Feltz)

2017-2018 Co-Principal Investigator for *Understanding Consumer Literacy about Milk*, UCLA Law School Animal Law and Policy Small Grants Program, \$4,470 (with Adam Feltz)

Co-PI for *Knowing What You Eat: Measuring the Effectiveness of Educational Interventions on Animal Consumption*. Animal Charity Evaluators, \$11,385. August 2017-May 2019 (with Adam Feltz, Syd Johnson, Mylan Engel, Ramona Ilea, Jacob Caton, and Carol Adams)

VegFund Grant, Carol Adams *The Sexual Politics of Meat* Lecture at MTU and NMU, Summer 2016 (\$150)

AWARDS AND HONORS

Teaching Recognition, "Exceptional Average of 7 Dimensions," Spring 2018, Michigan Tech.
This recognition is based on student evaluations at Michigan Tech. Among all teaching faculty, my teaching fell under the "Top 10 %."

Excellence in Teaching Award, Spring 2018
The Humanities Department nominated me for this award.

Teaching Recognition, "Exceptional Average of 7 Dimensions," Spring 2017, Michigan Technological University.
This recognition is based on student evaluations at Michigan Tech. Among all teaching faculty, my teaching fell under the "Top 10 %."

Schreiner University Summer Fellows Institute, Spring 2013
Two faculty members from each department were selected as representatives of excellent teaching. This honor entailed monetary recognition and a week-long workshop on pedagogy which resulted in several university-wide talks and cross-campus collaborations.

Fulbright Travel Grant, Summer 1998
The Fulbright Travel Grant covered my flight and provided me with start-up money when I studied abroad as an exchange student. It also entailed a weekend workshop in Bremen that prepared me for living abroad.

COMMUNITY OUTREACH

2013-Present: Founder of *StreetKnits*
StreetKnits is an international humanitarian knitting charity that provides knitwear to the homeless. Moreover, *StreetKnits* often pairs up with technical communication students in Texas and Michigan and raises awareness for homelessness while serving as a client in the academic classroom (www.streetknits2013.weebly.com).

COURSES TAUGHT

Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg, Germany:

- German Style Variations
- German Vocabulary Expansion

University of South Carolina, SC:

- Elementary German I and II

Kishwaukee College, IL:

- English Composition and Rhetoric
- English Composition and Literature
- Elementary German

Tallahassee Community College, FL:

- English Composition and Rhetoric

Schreiner University, TX:

- English Composition and Rhetoric
- English Composition and Literature
- Developmental Writing
- Technical Communication
- English Studies for Teachers
- Elementary German I and II (face-to-face and online)
- Intermediate German I and II (face-to-face and online)

Michigan Technological University, MI:

- English Composition
- Technical Communication (online)
- German 1A (face-to-face and online)
- Intermediate Pronunciation (ESL)
- Advanced Listening and Speaking (ESL)
- Advanced Pronunciation (ESL)
- Advanced Vocabulary (ESL)
- Advanced Reading (ESL)
- Transitional Listening and Speaking (ESL)
- Academic Support (ESL)

University of Oklahoma, OK:

- ENGL 1113: Principles of Composition I
- ENGL 1213: Principles of Composition II

SERVICE

2021-Present: Member of the Editorial Board of The South Oval Review, the undergraduate journal launched in OU's FYC program

2020-Present: Member of the Celebration of Writing Committee, First-Year Writing Program at the University of Oklahoma

2020-Present: Member of the Professional Development Workshops Committee, First-Year Writing Program at the University of Oklahoma

2019-2020: Chair of the Archives Committee, First-Year Writing Program at the University of Oklahoma

2018-2019: Member of the Archives Committee, First-Year Writing Program at the University of Oklahoma

2016-2018: Co-Founding Editor of the undergraduate research journal, *The Portage Review* at Michigan Tech

2016-2017: Co-Founder of the Graduate Student Mentorship Program at Michigan Tech

2012-2014: Co-Advisor of the English Creative Writing Group at Schreiner University

2011-2014: Director of Monday Night Fiction at Schreiner University

2010-2011: Co-Director of Monday Night Fiction at Schreiner University

2010-2014: Member of the Allied Advance Program at Schreiner University

2009-2014: Co-Advisor of Delta Phi Epsilon at Schreiner University

2009-2012: Co-Advisor of Sigma Tau Delta at Schreiner University

2009-2014: Founder & Faculty Advisor of the German Stammtisch at Schreiner University

2009-2011: Founder of the English Composition Group at Schreiner University

2009-2010: Secretary of AAUW at Schreiner University

2003-2004: Member of the International Committee at Kishwaukee College

2003-2004: Founder of the German Stammtisch at Kishwaukee College

MEMBERSHIPS

2017-Present: Conference on College Composition and Communication

2016-2018: Association of Teachers of Technical Writing

2018-present: Affiliate member of the Women's and Gender Studies Faculty at the University of Oklahoma

LANGUAGES

German, native speaker
English, fluent

REFERENCES

Dr. Syd Johnson
Associate Professor
Center for Bioethics and Humanities
SUNY Upstate Medical University
618 Irving Avenue
Syracuse, NY 13210
johnsols@upstate.edu

Dr. Marika Seigel
Associate Professor of Rhetoric & Technical Communication
Michigan Technological University
Department of Humanities
1400 Townsend Drive
Houghton MI 49931
maseigel@mtu.edu

Dr. Mylan Engel
Professor of Philosophy
Northern Illinois University
1425 Lincoln Drive
DeKalb IL 60115
mylan-engel@niu.edu

ADAM FELTZ

CURRICULUM VITAE

January 2021

CONTACT INFORMATION

Department of Psychology
455 W. Lindsey Street
Dale Hall Tower, Room 705
Norman, OK 73019-2007
(850) 591-1745
adfeltz@ou.edu

EDUCATION

Florida State University	Ph.D., Philosophy, August 2008
Northern Illinois University	M.A., Philosophy, May 2004
University of South Carolina	B.A., Philosophy, December 1998

EMPLOYMENT AND APPOINTMENTS

University of Oklahoma	Associate Professor of Psychology, 2018-present
Michigan Technological University	Associate Professor of Psychology and Applied Ethics, 2017-2018
	Assistant Professor of Psychology and Applied Ethics 2013-2017
Schreiner University	Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Interdisciplinary Studies (tenure track), 2008-2013
Max-Planck Institute for Human Development Center for Adaptive Behavior and Cognition	Visiting Research Scientist, July 2009-May 2012
RiskLiteracy.org	Co-founder and co-managing director (2012-present)

RESEARCH AND TEACHING INTERESTS

Areas of Specialization	Psychology of Philosophical Judgment & Intuition, Applied Ethics, Philosophy of Mind
Areas of Competence	Ethics, Philosophy of Psychology

GRANTS AND CONSULTING

1. 2021-2024. Co-Principal Investigator for *EFRI E3P: Tuning Catalyst Design to Recycle Mixed Polymer Streams*. National Science Foundation. \$1,999,987.
2. 2021-2023. Senior personnel for Carbon-free H₂ Production and Storage (CHEPS). Big Ideas Challenge, University of Oklahoma. \$150,000.
3. 2020-2021. Principal Investigator for *Understanding Rodeos: Education, Policy, and Attitudes Concerning Animals in Entertainment*. UCLA Law School Animal Law and Small Grants Program. \$3,230.
4. 2017-2018. \$20,500 Grant. Title: *Risk Communication with Partners: Your Guide to Resources and Recommendations* (Oct 2017-Oct 2018). Principal Investigator Edward T. Cokely, with Co-principal Investigators Rocio Garcia-Retamero & Adam Feltz, and Co-investigator Dafina Petrova. Funded by Medscape, USA (Medscape ID #: SF232838).
5. 2017 – 2018. WebMD & Medscape Risk Literacy Continuing Medical Education Educational Partnership (External Consultants Edward Cokely, Rocio Garcia-Retamero, Adam Feltz, & Dafina Petrova) for "*Risk Communication With Patients: Your Guide to Resources and Recommendations*." Project Director Haleh Kadkhoda of MedScape Education. Funded by Pfizer Foundation Grant (\$209,500).
6. 2017-2018 Co-Principal Investigator for *Understanding Consumer Literacy about Milk*, UCLA Law School Animal Law and Policy Small Grants Program, \$4,470.
7. 2016-2018. Principal Investigator for *The Outcome Evaluation of Positive Peer Group for American Indians with Substance Use Related Offence*, Portage Health Foundation, Research Excellence Fund, \$58,111.
8. 2017-2020. Principal Investigator for *Knowing What You Eat: Measuring the Effectiveness of Educational Interventions on Animal Consumption*. Animal Charity Evaluators, \$11,385.
9. 2010-2012. Recipient and Co-Primary Investigator of \$200,000 *A Science of Virtue* grant from Arete Initiative at the University of Chicago.
10. 2011. \$14,600 Survey Research Support (October 2010-October 2011). Title: Influences of Affect on Philosophical Intuitions (Time-Sharing Proposal ID TESS-0090). Edward T. Cokely, Adam Feltz, and Mirta Galesic. Time-Sharing Experiments in Social Sciences funded by the Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences Directorate of the NSF.

PUBLICATIONS

1. Mahmoud-Elhaj, D., Tanner, B., Sabatini, D., & Feltz, A. (2020). Measuring objective knowledge of potable recycled water. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 48, 2033-2052.
2. Offer-Westort, T., Feltz, A., Bruskotter, J., & Vucetich, J. (2020). What is an endangered species?: Judgments about acceptable risk. *Environmental Research Letters*, 15, 014010.
3. Earp, B. D., Demaree-Cotton, J., Dunn, M., Dranseika, V., Everett, J. A. C., Feltz,

- A., Geller, G., Hannikainen, I. R., Jansen, L., Knobe, J., Kolak, J., Latham, S., Lerner, A., May, J., Mercurio, M., Mihailov, E., Rodriguez-Arias, D., Rodriguez Lopez, B., Savulescu, J., Sheehan, M., Strohminger, N., Sugarman, J., Tabb, K., & Tobia, K. (2020). Experimental philosophical bioethics. *AJOB Empirical Bioethics*, 11, 30-33.
4. Feltz, S. & Feltz, A. (2019). Consumer accuracy at identifying plant-based and dairy-based milk products. *Food Ethics*, 4, 85-112.
 5. Feltz, S., & Feltz, A. (2019). The Knowledge of Animals as Food Scale. *Human-Animal Interaction Bulletin*, 7, 19-45.
 6. Feltz, A., & Cokely, E.T. (2019) Extraversion and compatibilist intuitions: A ten-year retrospective and meta-analysis. *Philosophical Psychology*, 32, 388-403.
 7. Cokely, E. T., Feltz, A., Ghazal, S., Allan, J., Petrova, D., & Garcia-Retamero, R. (2018). Skilled Decision Theory: From intelligence to numeracy and expertise. In A. Ericsson, R. Hoffman, A. Kozbelt, & A. Williams (Eds.), *Cambridge Handbook of Expertise and Expert Performance* (pp. 476-505). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 8. Brown, L., Feltz, A., & Wallace, C. (2018). Lab exercises for a discrete structures course: exploring logic and relational algebra with Alloy. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual ACM Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education (ITiCSE 2018)* (pp. 135-140). New York: ACM.
 9. Garcia-Retamero, R., Petrova, D., Feltz, A., & Cokely, E.T. (2017). Measuring Graph Literacy: A systematic review and a meta-analysis. *Encyclopedia of Health and Risk Message Design and Processing*. Cambridge University Press.
 10. Feltz, A., & Cokely, E.T. (2017). Informing ethical decision making. In K. Rommelfanger & L.S. Johnson (Eds.) *Handbook of Neuroethics* (pp. 304-318). New York: Routledge.
 11. Feltz, A., & May, J. (2017). The means/side-effect distinction in moral cognition: A meta-analysis. *Cognition*, 166, 314-327.
 12. Feltz, A. (2017). Folk intuitions. In M. Griffith, N. Levy, & K. Timpe (eds) *The Routledge Companion to Free Will* (pp. 468-576). New York: Routledge.
 13. Feltz, A., & Cokely, E. T. (2016). Personality and philosophical bias. In J. Sytsma & W. Buckwalter (Eds.), *A Companion to Experimental Philosophy* (pp. 578-589). New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
 14. Feltz, A. (2016). Surrogate financial decision making: Lessons from applied experimental philosophy. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 19, doi: 10.1017/sjp.2016.54 .
 15. Feltz, A., Cokely, E. T., & Nelson, B. (2016). Experimental philosophy needs to matter: Reply to Andow and Cova. *Philosophical Psychology*, 29, 567-569.
 16. Feltz, A. (2015). Experimental philosophy of actual and counterfactual free will intuitions. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 36, 113-130.
 17. Feltz, A. (2015). Everyday attitudes about euthanasia and the slippery slope argument. In M. Cholbi & J. Varelius (Eds.), *New Directions in the Ethics of Assisted Suicide* (pp. 217-237). New York: Springer.
 18. Feltz, A., & Millan, M. (2015). An error theory for compatibilist intuitions. *Philosophical Psychology*, 28, 529-555.
 19. Feltz, A. (2015). Ethical information transparency and sexually transmitted diseases. *Current HIV Research*, 13, 421-431.

20. Cokely, E.T., & Feltz, A. (2014). Expert Intuition. In L. Osbeck & B. Held (Eds.) *Rational Intuition* (pp. 213-238). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
21. Feltz, A., & Cova, F. (2014). Moral responsibility and free will: A meta-analysis. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 30, 234-246.
22. Feltz, A., & Cokely, E.T. (2014). The terror or 'terrorists': An investigation in experimental applied ethics. *Behavioral Sciences of Terrorism and Political Aggression*, 6, 195-211.
23. Feltz, A., & Cokely, E.T. (2013). Predicting philosophical disagreement. *Philosophy Compass*, 8/10, 978-989.
24. Feltz, A., & Cokely, E.T. (2013). Virtue or consequences: The folk against Pure Evaluational Internalism. *Philosophical Psychology*, 26, 702-717.
25. Feltz, A. (2013). Pereboom and premises: Asking the right questions in the experimental philosophy of free will. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 22, 54-63.
26. Feltz, A., & Samayoa, S. (2012). Heuristics and life-sustaining treatments. *Journal of Bioethical Inquiry*, 9, 443-455.
27. Feltz, A., & Abt, T. (2012). Claims about surrogate decision-making accuracy require empirical evidence. *The American Journal of Bioethics*, 12, 41-43.
28. Feltz, A., & Cokely, E.T. (2012). The virtues of ignorance. *The Review of Philosophy and Psychology*, 3, 335-350.
29. Feltz, A., Harris, M., & Perez, A. (2012). Perspective in intentional action attribution. *Philosophical Psychology*, 25, 673-687.
30. Feltz, A., Perez, A., & Harris, M. (2012). Free will, causes, and decisions: Individual differences in written reports. *The Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 19, 166-189.
31. Feltz, A., & Cokely, E.T. (2012). The Philosophical Personality Argument. *Philosophical Studies*, 161, 227-246.
32. Cokely, E.T., & Feltz, A. (2011). Virtue in business: Morally better, praiseworthy, trustworthy, and more satisfying. *Journal of Organizational Moral Psychology*, 2, 13-26.
33. Schulz, E., Cokely, E.T., & Feltz, A. (2011). Persistent bias in expert judgments about free will and moral responsibility: A test of the Expertise Defense. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 20, 1722-1731.
34. Feltz, A., & Cokely, E.T. (2011). Individual Differences in Theory-of-Mind Judgments: Order Effects and Side Effects. *Philosophical Psychology*, 24, 343-355.
35. Miller, J., & Feltz, A. (2011). Frankfurt and the folk: An Empirical Investigation. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 20, 401-414.
36. Feltz, A., & Zarpentine, C. (2010). Do you know more when it matters less? *Philosophical Psychology*, 23, 683-706.
37. Feltz, A., Harris, M., & Perez, A. (2010). Actor-observer differences in intentional action intuitions. In S. Ohlsson & R. Catrambone (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society* (pp. 2560-2565). Austin, TX: Cognitive Science Society.
38. Cokely, E. T., & Feltz, A. (2010). Questioning the free will comprehension question. In S. Ohlsson & R. Catrambone (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society* (pp. 2440-2445). Austin, TX: Cognitive Science Society.
39. Feltz, A., & Bishop, M. (2010). The proper role of intuitions in epistemology. In

- M. Milkowski & K. Talmont-Kaminski (Eds.), *Beyond Description: Normativity in Naturalised Philosophy* (pp. 101-122). London: College Publications.
40. Cokely, E. T., & Feltz, A. (2010). Adaptive diversity and misbelief. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 32, 526.
 41. Livengood, J., Sytsma, J., Feltz, A., Scheines, R., & Machery, E. (2010). Philosophical temperament. *Philosophical Psychology*, 23, 313-330.
 42. Feltz, A. (2009). Experimental philosophy. *Analyse & Kritik*, 31, 201-219.
 43. Feltz, A., & Cokely, E.T. (2009). Do Judgments about Freedom and Responsibility Depend on Who You Are? Personality Differences in Intuitions about Compatibilism and Incompatibilism. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 18, 342-350. (Target Article)
 44. Cokely, E.T., & Feltz, A. (2009). Adaptive variation in judgment and philosophical intuition. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 18, 355-357.
 45. Cokely, E.T., & Feltz, A. (2009). Individual differences, judgment biases, and Theory-of-Mind: Deconstructing the intentional action side effect asymmetry. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43, 18-24.
 46. Feltz, A., Cokely, E.T., & Nadelhoffer, T. (2009). Natural compatibilism v. natural incompatibilism. *Mind & Language*, 24, 1-23.
 47. Feltz, A. (2008). Problems with the appeal to intuition in epistemology. *Philosophical Explorations*, 11, 131-141.
 48. Nadelhoffer, T., & Feltz, A. (2008). The actor-observer bias and moral intuitions: Adding fuel to Sinnott-Armstrong's fire. *Neuroethics*, 1, 133-144.
 49. Feltz, A., & Cokely, E. T. (2008). The fragmented folk: More evidence of stable individual differences in moral judgments and folk intuitions. In B. C. Love, K. McRae & V. M. Sloutsky (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 30th Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society* (pp. 1771-1776). Austin, TX: Cognitive Science Society.
 50. Nadelhoffer, T., & Feltz, A. (2007). Folk intuitions, slippery slopes, and necessary fictions: An essay on Saul Smilansky's free will illusionism. *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, 31, 202-213.
 51. Feltz, A. (2007). Knowledge, moral praise, and moral side effects. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 27, 123-126.
 52. Feltz, A. (2007). The Knobe effect: A brief overview. *The Journal of Mind and Behavior*, 28, 265-277.
 53. Feltz, A., & Cokely, E.T. (2007). An anomaly in intentional action ascriptions: More evidence of folk diversity. In D.S. McNamara & J.G. Trafton (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 29th Annual Cognitive Science Society* (p. 1748). Austin, TX: Cognitive Science Society.

REVIEWS

1. Feltz, S. & Feltz, A. (in press). Michael Bishop, *The Good Life: Integrating the Philosophy and Psychology of Well-being*. *Philosophical Psychology*.
2. Feltz, A. (in press). Joshua Knobe and Shaun Nichols, *Experimental Philosophy*. *Polish Journal of Philosophy*.
3. Feltz, A. (in press). Christina Miller, *Moral Character*. *Philosophical Psychology*.

INVITED PRESENTATIONS

1. "Ethical Risk Communication" University of Oklahoma, Spring 2018
2. "Informed, Ethical Decision Making"
North Carolina State University, Spring 2016
Tulane University, Spring 2016
3. "Ethical Information Transparency and Informed Decision Making" University Of Leeds, UK, Spring 2015.
4. "Philosophical Bias and Applied Experimental Philosophy" Northern Michigan University, Spring, 2014.
5. "Ethical Decision Making" Michigan Technological University, Houghton, MI, Spring 2013
6. "Predicting Philosophical Bias"
University of Central Florida, Summer, 2012.
University of California Merced, Spring 2013.
7. "Philosophical Dilemmas, Philosophical Personality, and Philosophy in Action" Experiments in Ethical Dilemmas University of London, London, Spring 2012.
8. "Persistent Bias in Philosophical Intuitions" Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Adaptive Behavior and Cognition Group, Berlin, Summer 2011.
9. "Heuristics of Virtue" A Science of Virtue Symposium, University of Chicago, Spring 2011.

REFEREED PRESENTATIONS

1. "Animal Production Consumption: Measurement and Education" German Institute for Economic Research (DIW), Berlin, Germany. Fall 2019.
2. "Applied ethics and animal consumption" 42nd Midsouth Philosophy Conference, Memphis, TN, Spring 2018.
3. "Know what you eat: Experimental Philosophy and Animal Ethics" 41st Midsouth Philosophy Conference, Memphis, TN. Spring 2017.
4. "The Means/Side-effect distinction in moral cognition: A meta-analysis" 41st Midsouth Philosophy Conference, Memphis, TN. Spring 2017.
5. "Measures of Agency" American Philosophical Association Central Meeting, Kansas City, MO, Spring 2017.
6. "Free will and Punishment: Measuring the Major Factors of Free Will Attitudes" 40th Midsouth Philosophy Conference, Memphis, TN. Spring 2016.
7. "The Knowledge of Brain Death Scale" poster presentation at the 36th Annual Society for Judgment and Decision Making conference, Chicago, IL, Fall 2015.
8. "Applied Experimental Philosophy: Death" 39th Annual Midsouth Philosophy Conference, Memphis, TN. Spring 2015.
9. "Moral Responsibility and Free Will: A Meta-analysis" The American Philosophical Association Central Division Meeting, Chicago, IL, Spring 2014.
10. "Experimental Philosophy of Actual and Counterfactual Free Will Intuitions" 38th Mid-South Philosophy Conference, Memphis, TN, Spring 2014.
11. "Free Will, Religion, and Fate: A Mediation Analysis" 37th Mid-South Philosophy

- Conference, Memphis, TN. Spring 2013.
12. "Most Folk are not Compatibilists." Northwest Philosophy Conference, Oregon State, Fall 2012.
 13. "Pereboom and premises: Asking the right questions in the experimental philosophy of free will" 36th Annual Midsouth Philosophy Conference, Memphis, Spring 2012.
 14. "Heuristics, Life-Sustaining Treatments, and Paternalism" Central Division of the American Philosophical Association, Minneapolis, Spring 2011.
 15. "A Test of the Expertise Defense: Persistent Bias in Expert Judgments about Free Will and Moral Responsibility"
 - 35th Annual Midsouth Philosophy Conference, Memphis, Spring 2011
 - Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology Annual Conference, New Orleans, Spring 2011.
 16. "Heuristics, Life-Sustaining Treatments, and Paternalism" 35th Annual Midsouth Philosophy Conference, Memphis, Spring 2011
 17. "The Philosophical Importance of Individual Differences" Experimental Philosophy Workshop, University of Wroclaw, Poland, Summer 2010.
 18. "Actor-Observer Differences in Intentional Action Intuitions" 34th Annual Mid-South Philosophy Conference, Memphis, Spring 2010.
 - 34th Annual Midsouth Philosophy Conference, Memphis, Spring 2010.
 - 32nd Annual Cognitive Science Society Conference, Portland, Oregon, Summer 2010.
 19. "The Philosophical Heritability Argument" at the 61st Northwest Philosophy Conference, Fall 2009.
 20. "Frankfurt and the Folk: An Experimental Investigation of Frankfurt-Style Cases" at the 33rd Annual Mid-South Philosophy Conference, Spring 2009.
 21. "Predicting Moral Judgment and Folk Intuitions" at the annual meeting of the Society for Judgment and Decision Making, Fall 2008.
 22. "Individual Differences and the 'Truth' about Right and Wrong: Predicting Variation in Meta-Ethics and Moral Judgments"
 - The 33rd Annual Mid-South Philosophy Conference, Spring 2009.
 - First Annual Interdisciplinary Approaches to Philosophy Conference, University of South Alabama, Spring 2009.
 23. "The Actor-Observer Bias and Moral Intuitions: Adding Fuel to Sinnott-Armstrong's Fire" Southern Society of Philosophy and Psychology, Spring 2008.
 24. "Do You Know More When It Matters Less?"
 - The 32nd Annual Mid-South Philosophy Conference, Spring 2008.
 - Southern Society of Philosophy And Psychology, Spring 2008
 25. "Folk Intuitions, Slippery Slopes, and Necessary Fictions: An Essay on Saul Smilansky's Free Will Illusionism," the Inland Northwest Philosophy Conference Spring 2006.
 26. "What is Intuition's Place in Epistemological Inquiry?" Southern Society of Philosophy and Psychology Conference, Spring 2005.
 27. Comments on John Bickle's "Real Revolution in Neuro-science: Tool Development" 40th Midsouth Philosophy Conference, Memphis, TN. Spring, 2106.
 28. Comments on Robert Barnard's "Expertise as Philosophical Reliablism."

- Mid-South Philosophy Conference, Memphis, Spring 2013.
29. Comments on Jeffery Englehardt's "The Problem of Second Effects" Midsouth Philosophy Conference, Memphis, Spring 2012.
 30. Comments on Matt Drabek's "Feedback Bias in the Social Sciences: The Case of Paraphilia" 35th Annual Mid-South Philosophy Conference, Spring, 2011.
 31. Comments on Walter Riker's "Must Corporations Obey the Spirit of the Law?" 35th Annual Mid-South Philosophy Conference, Spring, 2011.
 32. Comments on Kathleen Voh's "Lay Beliefs In Free Will" at the Werkmeister Conference on Experimental Philosophy, Florida State University, Spring 2010.
 33. Comments on Christopher Zarpentine's "Taking Diversity Seriously" at the 61st Annual Northwest Philosophy Conference, Fall 2009.
 34. Comments on Joseph Ulatowski's "Two Senses of 'Ought' in Forrester's Paradox" at the 33rd Annual Mid-South Philosophy Conference, Spring 2009.
 35. Comments on Adam Cureton's "Moral Intuitions about Large Numbers" at the Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology's annual meeting, Spring 2009.
 36. Comments on Adrian Patten's "Are the Rationality Wars Just?: A Look at the Question of Human Rationality," The 31st Annual Mid-South Philosophy Conference, Spring 2007.
 37. Comments on Stacey Swain, Joshua Alexander, and Jonathan Weinberg's "The Instability of Philosophical Intuitions: Running Hot and Cold on Truetemp," The First Annual On-line Philosophy Conference, Spring 2006.
 38. Comments on Jacob Canton's "The Trolley Problem in 3D". 41st Midsouth Philosophy Conference, Memphis, TN. Spring 2017

Editorial Service

Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied
Human-Animal Interaction Bulletin

Editorial Board
 Editorial Board
